

### **REMARKS**

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on September 20, 2005. Claims 3, 4 and 8-20 are canceled and claims 21-31 are added such that claims 1-2, 5-7 and 21-31 are now pending in this application.

#### **Interview Summary**

Applicant thanks Examiner Monica Lewis for the courtesy of a telephone interview on October 6, 2005 with Applicant's representative Andrew R. Peret.

Applicants' attorney and Examiner Lewis discussed the Damberg reference versus claim 1. Applicants' attorney pointed out that the Damberg reference does not include "a contact attached to the first surface of the interposer at the first section and the second section" as recited in claim 1. Applicants' attorney and Examiner Lewis also discussed possible ways to overcome the pending drawings objections.

The Examiner appeared to agree that the Damberg reference does not include "a contact attached to the first surface of the interposer at the first section and the second section" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner indicated that she would have to review the drawing objections and then contact Applicants' attorney the following day.

The Examiner subsequently left a voicemail for Applicants' attorney on the evening of Friday, October 7, 2005 which indicated that the Examiner was standing by the rejection and maintaining the drawing objections.

#### **Objections to the Drawings**

The Examiner states at page 2 of the Office Action that "[t]he drawings must show every feature . . . Therefore, the following must be shown . . . a) the first die is encapsulated; and b) the second die is encapsulated." Applicant has cancelled claims 3 and 4 such that this objection is moot.

The Examiner further states at page 3 of the Office Action that "it is not clear what reference numerals 50, 52, 54 and 56 represent. They are disclosed in the specification however

it is not clear what they represent.” Applicant has amended the specification to more clearly indicate what reference numerals 50, 52, 54 and 56 represent in FIG. 5.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending drawing objections.

Applicant submits six sheets of formal drawings herewith. It is believed that the drawings are in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84. No amendments have been made to the drawings.

#### §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1 and 3-5 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Damberg (U.S. 2004/0021211). As discussed during interview, the Damberg reference does not include “a contact attached to the first surface of the interposer at the first section and the second section” as recited in claim 1.

As part of making the rejection, the Examiner states at page 4 of the Office Action that “Damberg discloses the following . . . a contact (42) attached to a first surface of the interposer the first section and the second section (For Example: See Figure 4).” Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion because the contact 42 cited by the Examiner is not attached to the first surface of the interposer. Applicant notes that the contact 42 in Damberg is attached to the second surface and not the first surface where claim 1 recites that the first die engages the first surface at the first and second sections of the interposer.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 6 and 7 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has added claim 26 which includes all of the limitations of claims 1 and 2. In addition, Applicant has added claim 29 which includes all of the limitations of claims 1, 5 and 6.

*Reservation of Right to File Continuation or Divisional Applications*

Applicant respectfully traverses the drawing objections that are within the Office Action and reserves the right to reintroduce any claims their original form in one or more continuation or divisional applications at a later date.

*Reservation of Right to Swear Behind References*

Applicant reserves the right to swear behind any references which are cited in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§102(a), 102(e), 103/102(a), and 103/102(e). Statements distinguishing the claimed subject matter over the cited references are not to be interpreted as admissions that the references are prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney Andrew Peret at 262-646-7009, or the below-signed attorney at 612-349-9592, to facilitate prosecution of this application. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

IWEN CHAO ET AL.

By their Representatives,  
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 349-9592

Date Nov. 29, 2005

By Ann M. McCrackin  
Ann M. McCrackin  
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 29<sup>th</sup> day of November 2005.

CAROLYN HULSEY  
Name

Carolyn Hulsey  
Signature